



Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

CAROLYN A. MENDEZ-LUCK, HONGJIAN YU, YING-YING MENG, MONA JHAWAR AND STEVEN P. WALLACE

December 2004

Uninsured Californians report serious health problems that are complicated by their lack of having health insurance. One in five Californians without insurance coverage for all or part of the year reports that their health is fair or poor and one in 14 reports having asthma symptoms. Additionally, one in four uninsured adults (age 45 or older) reports being diagnosed with hypertension. Self-reported health, a reliable measure of current health, is also widely used as a proxy for future health outcomes. Therefore, poor overall health, asthma and hypertension are each problems that require regular medical monitoring and treatment—medical care that is likely to be hindered by having no health insurance.

This policy brief provides data for California counties and legislative districts that highlight the variations in the rates of self-reported fair or poor health, asthma and hypertension for children and adults without health insurance coverage for all or part of the year. The rates reported in this policy brief are estimates created by a small-area methodology, based on data from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS 2001) that are applied to population data from the 2000 Census and 2002 California Department of Finance.

Self-Reported Fair or Poor Health Among Uninsured Californians Across State Legislative and Congressional Districts

Approximately 1.4 million uninsured Californians reported being in fair or poor health. The rates of fair or poor health ranged from 11 to 32% in Assembly districts and from 13 to 31% in Senate districts (Exhibits 1 and 2). The majority of legislative districts had rates similar to the statewide average of 22%, although some legislative districts across the state fared better and worse than the statewide average. The legislative districts with the highest rates of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured were primarily located in parts of Los Angeles County. High rates were also found in legislative districts located along an interior corridor of the state

extending from Alameda and Contra Costa counties in the north to Kern County in the south. Assembly and Senate districts with rates better than the statewide average were primarily located in the greater San Francisco Bay region, in Southern California and in the northern Sierra counties.

The variation in rates of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured in Congressional districts was similar to our findings on state legislative districts, and ranged from 12 to 30% (Exhibit 3). Congressional districts with rates worse than the statewide average were primarily located in the same regions of the state as legislative districts.

Self-Reported Fair or Poor Health Across Counties

The rates of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured ranged from 10 to 31% in California counties (Exhibit 4). Tulare and Napa counties had the highest rates of uninsured residents with fair/poor health status, where almost one in every three uninsured residents reported having fair or poor health. In contrast, uninsured residents of the northern Sierra counties—such as Placer and El Dorado—reported having fair or poor health at rates almost half that of the statewide average.

Self-Reported Fair or Poor Health in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas

Over one-half million Los Angeles County residents without health insurance reported having fair or poor health (Exhibit 4). The rates of self-reported fair or poor health ranged from 16 to 28% in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas (LA SPAs). Half of the LA SPAs were near the statewide average, with the highest rate in LA SPA Metro—that includes the downtown, midtown and northeast areas of the City of Los Angeles. The lowest rate of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured was found in LA SPA West—that includes West Los Angeles, and the cities of Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Culver City and Santa Monica.

(Continued on page 2)

Exhibit 1:
Chronic Condition Rates
Among the Uninsured by
Assembly District

Source: 2001 California Health
Interview Survey, 2000-2002
Current Population Surveys,
and the 2000 Census.

**Assembly
Districts**

District Number	County Location of Assembly District	UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS					
		Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages		Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages		Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	22	1,465,000	7	469,000	28	307,000
01	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma, Trinity	14	11,000	10	8,000	32	6,000
02	Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo	19	14,000	10	8,000	26	4,000
03	Butte, Lassen, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sierra, Yuba	13	9,000	10	7,000	26	4,000
04	Alpine, El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento	12	7,000	13	7,000	37	4,000
05	Placer, Sacramento	17	10,000	12	7,000	26	3,000
06	Marin, Sonoma	17	9,000	8	4,000	24	3,000
07	Napa, Solano, Sonoma	24	15,000	13	8,000	27	4,000
08	Solano, Yolo	21	10,000	10	5,000	32	2,000
09	Sacramento	17	13,000	12	9,000	25	3,000
10	Amador, El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin	16	9,000	9	5,000	23	3,000
11	Contra Costa	15	7,000	11	5,000	— [†]	—
12	San Francisco, San Mateo	15	10,000	6 [†]	4,000	26	4,000
13	San Francisco	16	13,000	7	6,000	30	5,000
14	Alameda, Contra Costa	16	8,000	12	6,000	26 [†]	2,000
15	Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin	16	6,000	11	4,000	22	2,000
16	Alameda	28	18,000	8	5,000	— [†]	—
17	Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus	24	23,000	6	6,000	29	4,000
18	Alameda	29	15,000	7 [†]	4,000	19 [†]	2,000
19	San Mateo	11 [†]	4,000	— [†]	—	— [†]	—
20	Alameda, Santa Clara	24	10,000	6	2,000	20	2,000
21	San Mateo, Santa Clara	14	5,000	6 [†]	2,000	22	1,000
22	Santa Clara	20	9,000	5 [†]	3,000	35	3,000
23	Santa Clara	27	20,000	4 [†]	3,000	33	4,000
24	Santa Clara	21	9,000	6 [†]	3,000	32	3,000
25	Calaveras, Madera, Mariposa, Mono, Stanislaus, Tuolumne	22	15,000	8	5,000	35	5,000
26	San Joaquin, Stanislaus	25	20,000	7	5,000	27	4,000
27	Monterey, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	17	11,000	6	4,000	25	3,000
28	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	25	26,000	3	3,000	31	4,000
29	Fresno, Madera, Tulare	23	17,000	13	10,000	28	3,000
30	Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare	29	36,000	7	8,000	29	5,000
31	Fresno, Tulare	28	33,000	12	14,000	30	5,000
32	Kern, San Bernardino	18	14,000	8	6,000	23	3,000
33	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara	20	18,000	8	7,000	30	4,000
34	Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare	26	24,000	8	7,000	33	5,000
35	Santa Barbara, Ventura	25	23,000	7	6,000	27	4,000
36	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	25	19,000	14	11,000	38	5,000
37	Los Angeles, Ventura	23	15,000	9	6,000	32	4,000

(Continued)

**Asthma Symptom Rates Among Uninsured
Californians—Legislative and Congressional
Districts**

Approximately 469,000 uninsured California children and adults who were previously diagnosed with asthma had at least one asthma symptom during the year. The rates of asthma symptoms for uninsured children and adults ranged from 3 to 14% in Assembly districts and from 4 to 12% in Senate districts (Exhibits 1 and 2). The majority of legislative districts had asthma symptom rates for the uninsured population similar to the statewide average of 7%, although some legislative districts across the state fared better or worse than the

statewide average. The legislative districts with higher asthma symptom rates for uninsured children and adults were found throughout California, primarily in interior regions of the state—such as the Central Valley and the Inland Empire. Assembly and Senate districts with lower asthma symptom rates among the uninsured were primarily located in parts of Southern California and along the central coast.

The variation in asthma symptom rates for uninsured children and adults in Congressional districts was similar to our findings on state legislative districts, and ranged from 4 to 12% (Exhibit 3). Since Congressional districts encompass larger geographic areas than state legislative districts,

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

District Number	County Location of Assembly District	UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS					
		Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages		Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages		Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	22	1,465,000	7	469,000	28	307,000
38	Los Angeles, Ventura	17	10,000	8	5,000	27	3,000
39	Los Angeles	21	29,000	4	6,000	26	5,000
40	Los Angeles	21	21,000	5	5,000	28	4,000
41	Los Angeles, Ventura	20	13,000	7	4,000	30	4,000
42	Los Angeles	14	11,000	7	6,000	32	5,000
43	Los Angeles	18	18,000	4	4,000	35	7,000
44	Los Angeles	20	14,000	7	5,000	27	4,000
45	Los Angeles	27	46,000	6	10,000	27	7,000
46	Los Angeles	32	60,000	5	9,000	27	7,000
47	Los Angeles	20	19,000	7	7,000	33	5,000
48	Los Angeles	30	45,000	6	9,000	32	7,000
49	Los Angeles	27	25,000	4†	4,000	22	4,000
50	Los Angeles	26	32,000	4	6,000	28	5,000
51	Los Angeles	24	26,000	6	7,000	30	5,000
52	Los Angeles	26	35,000	6	8,000	35	5,000
53	Los Angeles	17	11,000	6	4,000	25	3,000
54	Los Angeles	20	17,000	7	6,000	26	4,000
55	Los Angeles	24	25,000	6	6,000	25	4,000
56	Los Angeles, Orange	21	18,000	6	5,000	29	4,000
57	Los Angeles	24	21,000	6	5,000	27	4,000
58	Los Angeles	24	22,000	5	5,000	27	4,000
59	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	20	12,000	9	5,000	26	3,000
60	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino	17	9,000	7	4,000	26	3,000
61	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	26	26,000	5	5,000	27	4,000
62	San Bernardino	26	28,000	6	6,000	27	4,000
63	Riverside, San Diego	22	16,000	6	5,000	27	3,000
64	Orange	16	14,000	11	9,000	22	3,000
65	Orange	20	17,000	12	10,000	26	4,000
66	Orange	18	14,000	10	8,000	23	3,000
67	Orange	16	11,000	8	5,000	29	4,000
68	Orange	21	20,000	6	6,000	30	5,000
69	Orange	24	36,000	4	7,000	31	5,000
70	Orange	13	7,000	8	5,000	32	3,000
71	Orange, Riverside	14	9,000	9	5,000	25	3,000
72	Orange	21	19,000	7	6,000	32	4,000
73	Orange, San Diego	16	11,000	8	6,000	30	3,000
74	San Diego	19	14,000	6	4,000	29	4,000
75	San Diego	13	8,000	6	4,000	28	3,000
76	San Diego	16	14,000	6	6,000	30	4,000
77	San Diego	17	12,000	7	5,000	30	4,000
78	San Diego	17	15,000	6	5,000	30	4,000
79	San Diego	21	25,000	4	5,000	29	5,000
80	Imperial, Riverside	22	26,000	7	9,000	29	6,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the “95% range.” The “95% range” (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Assembly district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each Assembly district are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

† Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

the asthma symptom rates for the uninsured population are distributed more broadly across the state. Thus, asthma symptom rates worse than the statewide average were found in larger areas within the same counties that were already mentioned for legislative districts.

Asthma Symptom Rates Across Counties and Los Angeles Service Planning Areas

The rates of asthma symptoms for the uninsured population ranged from 4 to 17% in California counties and from 5 to 17% in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas (Exhibit 4). Notably high rates of asthma symptoms for the uninsured in California counties were found in the northern Sierra counties

Exhibit 1: (continued) Chronic Condition Rates Among the Uninsured by Assembly District

Source: 2001 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys, and the 2000 Census.

Assembly Districts

as well as some interior regions of the state. However, low rates were also found in the central valley counties of Madera and San Joaquin, as well as Santa Clara County. The majority of LA SPAs had asthma symptom rates for the uninsured population near the statewide average (Exhibit 4). However, one LA SPA (Antelope Valley) had a notably high rate of 17%, more than two times the statewide average.

Hypertension Among Uninsured Adults Age 45 and Older Across California Legislative and Congressional Districts

The data presented in this section are for uninsured adults age 45 and older because high blood pressure continues to be more common in older age groups despite being on the rise among people at younger ages. In 2002, over 300,000 uninsured adults age 45 and older had high blood pressure that was diagnosed by a doctor at some time in their lives. Hypertension affects from 19 to 38% of people age 45 and older in California's 80 Assembly districts, and from 21 to 37% in the state's 40 Senate districts (Exhibits 1 and 2). The majority of legislative districts had high blood pressure rates similar to or worse than the statewide average of 28% for this population. The legislative districts with the highest rates of diagnosed high blood pressure among this uninsured population were located primarily in parts of Los Angeles County and in counties east and south of the state's capitol. The legislative districts with the lowest rates of diagnosed high blood pressure among uninsured adults age 45 and older were primarily located in the greater San Francisco Bay region.

The 18 to 33% variation in hypertension rates among uninsured adults age 45 and older for Congressional districts is similar to our findings on state legislative districts. The majority of California's 53 Congressional districts had rates similar to or worse than the statewide average (Exhibit 3). Since Congressional districts cover larger geographic areas and represent bigger populations than either Assembly or Senate districts, the Congressional districts with higher rates of diagnosed hypertension among the uninsured adult population include many of the same counties as those mentioned for state legislative districts, as well as the northern Sierra counties, and the greater Southern California region.

Hypertension Among Uninsured Adults in California Counties

The rates of diagnosed hypertension among uninsured adults age 45 and older ranged from 15 to 42% for California counties (Exhibit 4). In Imperial and El Dorado counties, almost one in every two uninsured adults age 45 or older had been diagnosed with high blood pressure at some time in their lives. However, several counties had notably low hypertension rates, including Santa Cruz with

the lowest hypertension rate among this uninsured age group (15%).

Hypertension Among Uninsured Adults in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas

The rates of diagnosed hypertension among uninsured adults age 45 and older ranged from 25 to 45% for Los Angeles Service Planning Areas (Exhibit 4). The majority of LA SPAs had rates at or near the statewide average, however, two LA SPAs had notably high hypertension rates; LA SPA Antelope Valley had the highest rate among this uninsured age group (45%).

Conclusion

The data in this policy brief provide legislators and program planners the opportunity to improve the health of the uninsured. Although one Senate district (SD8) and one Congressional District (CD12), both located in parts of San Francisco and San Mateo counties, had uniformly good rates of self-reported fair or poor health, asthma symptoms and diagnosed hypertension, this was generally not the case for most of California. The Central Valley had the most locations where uninsured residents reported multiple health problems, but the significant geographic variations in the rates of two major chronic conditions and overall poor health for uninsured Californians suggest that the health needs of the uninsured vary widely throughout the state.

The frequent reporting of chronic conditions by those without health insurance throughout the state documents their need for appropriate access to medical care. Local communities have a number of strategies that can expand health insurance coverage and thereby promote regular access to health care professionals. First, communities can redouble local outreach efforts to enroll every uninsured individual who currently qualifies for public health insurance, without any changes to programmatic eligibility criteria. Second, communities can expand the eligibility criteria for local indigent health insurance programs to include currently ineligible groups of uninsured individuals. A related strategy involves advocating for more generous eligibility criteria for state public insurance programs. Third, communities can work with local employers to bolster employer-based health insurance where most Californians continue to get their coverage.

Each of these strategies would likely redistribute existing public tax expenditures for the uninsured in a more cost-effective manner. Moreover, such a redistribution to expand access to medical care would relieve the chronic burden on safety-net providers. Public and private efforts that extend health insurance coverage to all Californians are key public health steps in dealing with the problems of chronic illness and improving their health and wellbeing.

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

District Number	County Location of Senate District	UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS					
		Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages		Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages		Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	22	1,465,000	7	469,000	28	307,000
01	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra	13	14,000	11	12,000	30	8,000
02	Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Solano, Sonoma	19	25,000	12	15,000	30	9,000
03	Marin, San Francisco, Sonoma	16	22,000	7	10,000	27	8,000
04	Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Nevada, Placer, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba	16	22,000	10	15,000	27	8,000
05	Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Yolo	20	26,000	6	8,000	22	5,000
06	Sacramento	17	24,000	12	17,000	25	6,000
07	Contra Costa	13	10,000	11	8,000	—†	—
08	San Francisco, San Mateo	13	14,000	5	6,000	21	5,000
09	Alameda, Contra Costa	24	29,000	10	11,000	22†	4,000
10	Alameda, Contra Costa	27	26,000	6	6,000	21	4,000
11	San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	17	15,000	7	6,000	24	4,000
12	Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, Stanislaus	27	53,000	6	12,000	37	10,000
13	Santa Clara	25	32,000	5†	6,000	34	7,000
14	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne	21	29,000	11	15,000	29	8,000
15	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	20	28,000	7	9,000	29	8,000
16	Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare	29	71,000	9	22,000	30	10,000
17	Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura	23	33,000	11	16,000	32	8,000
18	Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare	22	35,000	9	14,000	29	8,000
19	Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Ventura	21	29,000	8	11,000	28	7,000
20	Los Angeles	21	54,000	4	11,000	27	9,000
21	Los Angeles	19	31,000	6	9,000	31	11,000
22	Los Angeles	31	106,000	5	17,000	27	13,000
23	Los Angeles, Ventura	20	29,000	7	10,000	30	9,000
24	Los Angeles	26	52,000	5	11,000	25	8,000
25	Los Angeles	23	47,000	7	14,000	31	9,000
26	Los Angeles	25	62,000	7	16,000	33	13,000
27	Los Angeles	23	44,000	6	11,000	29	8,000
28	Los Angeles	21	35,000	6	10,000	25	8,000
29	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino	19	21,000	7	8,000	25	6,000
30	Los Angeles	25	53,000	5	11,000	27	8,000
31	Riverside, San Bernardino	19	31,000	8	13,000	24	7,000
32	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	26	55,000	6	12,000	28	8,000
33	Orange	15	19,000	8	10,000	32	7,000
34	Orange	24	62,000	5	13,000	31	10,000
35	Orange	15	19,000	8	10,000	29	8,000
36	Riverside, San Diego	16	20,000	8	10,000	28	7,000
37	Riverside	18	31,000	11	19,000	23	7,000
38	Orange, San Diego	18	26,000	7	10,000	29	7,000
39	San Diego	15	26,000	6	11,000	30	8,000
40	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego	21	51,000	5	13,000	30	10,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the “95% range.” The “95% range” (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Senate district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each Senate district are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

† Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

Exhibit 2: Chronic Condition Rates Among the Uninsured by Senate District

Source: 2001 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys, and the 2000 Census.

Senate Districts

Exhibit 3:
Chronic Condition
Rates Among the
Uninsured by
Congressional District
Source: 2001 California
Health Interview Survey,
2000-2002 Current
Population Surveys,
and the 2000 Census.

Congressional
Districts

District Number	County Location of Congressional District	UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS					
		Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages		Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages		Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	22	1,465,000	7	469,000	28	307,000
01	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Yolo	18	19,000	11	12,000	32	7,000
02	Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yolo, Yuba	17	19,000	11	12,000	27	6,000
03	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Sacramento, Solano	15	12,000	11	9,000	27	5,000
04	Butte, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra	12	10,000	11	9,000	31	6,000
05	Sacramento	17	19,000	12	13,000	25	5,000
06	Marin, Sonoma	18	15,000	10	8,000	21	4,000
07	Contra Costa, Solano	18	13,000	11	8,000	31	4,000
08	San Francisco	16	20,000	6†	8,000	29	7,000
09	Alameda	27	25,000	9	9,000	—	—
10	Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Solano	17	10,000	12	7,000	26	3,000
11	Alameda, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Santa Clara	18	14,000	5	4,000	19	3,000
12	San Francisco, San Mateo	12	8,000	5†	3,000	19†	3,000
13	Alameda	28	21,000	6†	5,000	18†	3,000
14	San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	16	11,000	6	4,000	24	3,000
15	Santa Clara	21	14,000	6†	4,000	32	4,000
16	Santa Clara	26	24,000	5†	4,000	33	5,000
17	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz	22	31,000	4	5,000	29	6,000
18	Fresno, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus	26	37,000	7	10,000	31	7,000
19	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Stanislaus, Tuolumne	24	26,000	10	11,000	33	7,000
20	Fresno, Kern, Kings	27	52,000	9	16,000	29	7,000
21	Fresno, Tulare	28	40,000	10	15,000	32	7,000
22	Kern, Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo	18	19,000	10	10,000	28	6,000
23	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura	25	39,000	7	10,000	29	7,000
24	Santa Barbara, Ventura	24	23,000	9	9,000	30	6,000
25	Inyo, Los Angeles, Mono, San Bernardino	22	23,000	11	12,000	32	6,000
26	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	21	17,000	7	6,000	25	4,000
27	Los Angeles	19	26,000	5	7,000	28	7,000
28	Los Angeles	20	37,000	4	8,000	28	7,000
29	Los Angeles	20	23,000	5	6,000	30	7,000
30	Los Angeles	13	11,000	7	7,000	30	6,000
31	Los Angeles	30	81,000	5	14,000	26	11,000
32	Los Angeles	26	39,000	5	8,000	25	6,000
33	Los Angeles	25	44,000	7	12,000	33	10,000
34	Los Angeles	29	63,000	5	11,000	28	9,000
35	Los Angeles	25	43,000	7	11,000	33	8,000
36	Los Angeles	22	27,000	6	7,000	25	6,000
37	Los Angeles	22	38,000	7	11,000	29	7,000
38	Los Angeles	24	35,000	6	8,000	26	6,000
39	Los Angeles	23	34,000	6	8,000	29	6,000
40	Orange	19	24,000	7	9,000	32	7,000
41	Riverside, San Bernardino	21	26,000	9	11,000	28	7,000
42	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino	16	14,000	7	6,000	26	4,000
43	San Bernardino	26	42,000	5	9,000	27	6,000
44	Orange, Riverside	17	21,000	10	12,000	22	4,000
45	Riverside	19	29,000	10	15,000	22	6,000
46	Los Angeles, Orange	16	16,000	8	8,000	28	6,000
47	Orange	24	51,000	5	10,000	31	8,000
48	Orange	13	12,000	8	7,000	31	5,000
49	Riverside, San Diego	18	22,000	9	11,000	26	5,000
50	San Diego	16	16,000	6	6,000	29	5,000
51	Imperial, San Diego	19	30,000	5	7,000	33	8,000
52	San Diego	16	15,000	7	7,000	29	5,000
53	San Diego	18	29,000	6	9,000	30	6,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the “95% range.” The “95% range” (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Congressional district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each Congressional district are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

† Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

	UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS					
	Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages		Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages		Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+	
	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
CALIFORNIA	22	1,465,000	7	469,000	28	307,000
Alameda	27	48,000	8	15,000	20†	7,000
Alpine, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono	13	4,000	—†	—	32	3,000
Butte	11	4,000	9	3,000	33	2,000
Colusa, Glenn, Tehama	25	5,000	11	2,000	23	1,000
Contra Costa	14	12,000	11	10,000	—†	—
Del Norte, Humboldt	13	3,000	11	3,000	34	2,000
El Dorado	11	3,000	12†	3,000	41	3,000
Fresno	25	43,000	14	24,000	29	7,000
Imperial	21	7,000	4†	2,000	42	2,000
Kern	23	34,000	7	11,000	23	5,000
Kings	27	7,000	8	2,000	37	1,000
Los Angeles	24	534,000	6	136,000	29	103,000
LA SPA Antelope Valley	25	13,000	17	9,000	45†	4,000
LA SPA East	25	75,000	5	16,000	28	13,000
LA SPA Metro	28	124,000	6	27,000	27	20,000
LA SPA San Fernando	19	80,000	5	21,000	29	21,000
LA SPA San Gabriel	24	74,000	6	18,000	25	13,000
LA SPA South	27	77,000	6	18,000	36	13,000
LA SPA South Bay	23	75,000	6	21,000	26	14,000
LA SPA West	16	16,000	—†	—	29	5,000
Lake, Mendocino	13	4,000	9	3,000	37	3,000
Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, Trinity	20	3,000	7†	1,000	36	2,000
Madera	29	9,000	5	1,000	33	2,000
Marin	18	5,000	—†	—	30†	2,000
Merced	27	12,000	9	4,000	37	3,000
Monterey, San Benito	21	23,000	—†	—	35	5,000
Napa	31	6,000	17†	3,000	32†	2,000
Nevada, Plumas, Sierra	—†	—	7†	1,000	—†	—
Orange	19	108,000	7	37,000	31	28,000
Placer	10†	2,000	14†	3,000	36†	2,000
Riverside	18	62,000	10	35,000	22	13,000
Sacramento	17	31,000	12	22,000	25	8,000
San Bernardino	24	83,000	6	22,000	28	15,000
San Diego	18	96,000	6	33,000	29	26,000
San Francisco	16	22,000	6†	9,000	29	8,000
San Joaquin	20	21,000	4†	4,000	18†	3,000
San Luis Obispo	14	6,000	10	4,000	35	3,000
San Mateo	12†	8,000	—†	—	—†	—
Santa Barbara	23	20,000	6†	5,000	23	3,000
Santa Clara	23	45,000	5†	11,000	33	11,000
Santa Cruz	22	10,000	8	4,000	15†	1,000
Shasta	12	3,000	10	3,000	19†	1,000
Solano	24	9,000	13	5,000	37	3,000
Sonoma	18	12,000	12	8,000	18†	3,000
Stanislaus	30	23,000	10†	8,000	39	5,000
Sutter/Yuba	24	5,000	16	3,000	30	1,000
Tulare	31	29,000	8†	7,000	34	5,000
Ventura	28	39,000	8†	11,000	33	9,000
Yolo	18	5,000	8†	2,000	27†	1,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the “95% range.” The “95% range” (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each county, county-group or LA SPA can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each County, County-Group and Los Angeles Service Planning Area are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

†Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

Exhibit 4:
Chronic Condition
Rates Among the
Uninsured by County,
County-Group and Los
Angeles Service
Planning Area
 Source: 2001 California
 Health Interview Survey,
 2000-2002 Current
 Population Surveys,
 and the 2000 Census.

County,
County-Group
or Los Angeles
Service
Planning Area

Data Source and Methods

This policy brief is based on findings from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS 2001), 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys (CPS), 2000 Census, 2002 Department of Finance population projections, and the file of legislative districts from the California State Senate Office of Demographics. The estimates of chronic conditions among the uninsured were created using a small-area methodology of the multiple data sources listed here. A detailed description of the methodology used in this study is available from the authors.

Author Information

Carolyn A. Mendez-Luck, PhD, MPH, is a Senior Researcher at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and the project director for this study. Hongjian Yu, PhD, is Associate Director of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and the senior statistician for this study. Ying-Ying Meng, DrPH, is a Senior Researcher at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. Mona Jhawar, MPH, is a Research Associate at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. Steven P. Wallace, PhD, is Associate Director of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and Professor at the UCLA School of Public Health.

Funder



The California Endowment funded the research and development of this policy brief.

Acknowledgements

The authors appreciate the valuable contributions of reviewers Shana Lavarreda, Nady Pourat, E. Richard Brown and Len Finocchio.

Citation

CA Mendez-Luck, H Yu, YY Meng, M Jhawar and SP Wallace. *Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement*. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2005.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, the Regents of the University of California, The California Endowment, or other funding agencies.

PB2004-8

Copyright © 2004 by the Regents of the University of California

*Editor-in-Chief: E. Richard Brown, PhD
Director of Communications: Valerie Steiner
Communications Assistant: Celeste Maglan
Editing Services: Sheri Penney
Production: Ikkanda Design Group*



**The UCLA Center for Health Policy Research
is affiliated with the UCLA School of Public Health
and the UCLA School of Public Affairs**

UCLA Center for Health Policy Research

10911 Weyburn Avenue, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90024

First Class
Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
UCLA